

# Expected Cost Effect of Increasing the Size of a Frozen-Ground Waste Containment Project at Ft. Detrick, Maryland

Steven A. Grant October 2001

## Expected power-consumption effect of increasing the size of a frozen-ground waste containment project at Ft. Detrick, Maryland

Steven A. Grant<sup>1</sup>

#### Introduction

The Baltimore District of the Army Corps of Engineers was considering installing an artificial ground freezing system for waste isolation at a site in Ft. Detrick, Maryland. The size of the proposed waterisolation system had increased. This report presents the cost effect of this change in system size.

(6.096 m) wide, and 10 feet (3.048 m) deep. The two frozen-ground walls along the length of the isolated volume were to be installed at  $45^{\circ}$ . The two sides would meet at the lengthwise centerline of the project. The end frozen-ground walls would be installed vertically.

#### Site information

The site had a clay soil. A perched water table was located at 10-15 feet. For purposes of this report, a depth to the perched water table of 4 m (13.21 feet) was assumed. The depth to groundwater was not available but was assumed to be greater than 45 feet. Scenarios in which the perched water table was 2, 4, and 6 m thick were considered. As was conventional, the soil temperature was assumed to be equal to the mean annual temperature, which in Frederick, Maryland, was 12 °C. It was assumed that the soil had a porosity of 0.4 m<sup>3</sup>·m<sup>-3</sup> and that unsaturated soils had a volumetric water content of 0.2 m<sup>3</sup>·m<sup>-3</sup>. The pertinent thermal properties used in calculations are presented in Table 1. The coolant temperature was assumed to be -25 °C. At this temperature, both saturated and unsaturated soils should contain about 0.015 m<sup>3</sup>·m<sup>-3</sup> liquid water [Grant et al., 1999]. Water's enthalpy of fusion was  $337.7 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$ .

#### Original design

The original design for the frozen-ground waste isolation project was 30 feet (9.144 m) long, 20 feet

#### Revised design

The revised design would be 50 feet (15.240 m) long, 45 feet (13.716 m) wide, and 45 feet (13.716 m) deep. The installation angle of the freeze pipes along the length of the isolated volume would have to be  $63.4^{\circ}$  to achieve this geometry.

#### Length of freeze pipe needed

The length of pipe needed was based on a 0.1-m-diameter pipe, placed at 1-m increments around the perimeter of the system. These increments were smaller than was conventional design practice but were chosen to reduce the time needed to form the barrier [Sanger and Sayles, 1979; Andersland and Ladanyi, 1994].

#### Original design

The original design would require 18 4.30-m-long, 4 3.048-m-long, 4 3.05-m-long and 4 1.52-m-long pipes. The total length of pipe would be 107.87 m.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>U.S. Army Engineering Research and Development Center, Cold Regions Research & Engineering Laboratory, 72 Lyme Road, Hanover NH 03755.

Material	Heat capacity	Thermal conductivity	Density
	$\mathrm{kJ}{\cdot}^{\circ}\mathrm{C}^{-1}{\cdot}\mathrm{kg}^{-1}$	$W.^{\circ}C^{-1}.m^{-1}$	${ m Mg}{\cdot}{ m m}^{-3}$
Clay	0.92	0.9	$1.59^{a}$
Water Ice	4.2177 $2.09$	0.56 2.21	1.0 0.9

Table 1. Selected thermal properties of system components.

Source: Alter [1969].

All of the pipe would be installed in unsaturated soil.

#### Revised design

The revised design would require 30 15.32-m-long, 4 13.72-m-long, 4 11.76-m-long, 4 9.80-m-long, 4 7.84-m-long, 4 5.88-m-long, 4 3.92-m-long and 4 1.96-m-long pipes. The total length of pipe would be 679.72 m, slightly more than six times the length required in the original design. All except the shortest freeze pipes would be installed in both water-saturated and unsaturated soil. The various total lengths of pipe that would be installed in unsaturated or unsaturated soil are presented in Table 2.

#### Calculation of thermal properties

#### Heat capacity

The heat capacities of unfrozen soils were calculated via:

$$c_{vu} = \frac{\rho_d}{\rho_w} \left( 0.17 + 1.0 f_w \right) c_{vw}. \tag{1}$$

The heat capacities of frozen soils were calculated via:

$$c_{vf} = \frac{\rho_d}{\rho_w} \left[ 0.17 + 1.0 f_u + 0.5 \left( f_w - f_u \right) \right] c_{vw}$$
 (2)

[Andersland and Ladanyi, 1994, p. 57]. The calculated heat capacities are presented in Table 3.

#### Thermal conductivity

The thermal conductivities of the unfrozen and frozen soils were estimated with the protocols presented in *Andersland and Ladanyi* [1994, p. 53-54] The thermal conductivities of the soils were calculated via:

$$k = (k_{\text{sat}} - k_{\text{dry}})K_e + k_{\text{dry}}.$$
 (3)

For the unfrozen soils the Kersten number was calculated via:

$$K_e = \log S_r + 1.0.$$
 (4)

This yielded values of 0.7 for the unsaturated soil and 1.0 for the saturated soil. The Kersten number was also 1.0 for the saturated and unsaturated frozen soil. The thermal conductivity of the dry soil was calculated via:

$$k_{\rm dry} = \frac{0.137\rho_d + 0.0647}{2.7 - 0.947\rho_d} \tag{5}$$

which yielded a value  $0.2366~\mathrm{W}\cdot\mathrm{^{\circ}C^{-1}\cdot\mathrm{m^{-1}}}$ . The thermal conductivity of saturated unfrozen soils was calculated via:

$$k_{\text{sat}} = k_s^{1-n} k_w^n \tag{6}$$

yielding a value of 0.7444 W.°C<sup>-1</sup>⋅m<sup>-1</sup>. The thermal conductivity of saturated unfrozen soils was calculated via:

$$k_{\text{sat}} = k_s^{1-n} k_w^{f_u} k_i^{n-f_u} \tag{7}$$

yielding a value of 1.2629 W·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-1</sup>. The calculated thermal conductivities are presented in Table 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Bulk density

Table 2. Total lengths of pipe and the lengths in unsaturated and saturated soil under the revised design				
for three thicknesses of the perched water table				

Perched water table thickness (m)	Total pipe le	<u> </u>
2	580.20	99.52
4	493.40	186.32
6	405.64	274.08

**Table 3.** Calculated thermal properties of the saturated and unsaturated soils and the attendant times to freeze and total energy demand.

Soil	$\frac{c_{vu}}{\text{MJ} \cdot {}^{\circ}\text{C}}$	$\frac{c_{vf}}{^{-1} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}}$	$\frac{k_u}{\mathbf{W} \cdot ^{\circ}\mathbf{C}}$	$\frac{k_f}{^{-1}\cdot\mathrm{m}^{-1}}$	$\frac{t}{\mathrm{days}}$	$\frac{Q}{\text{MJ}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}}$
Unsat.	2.4813	1.8610	0.9233	1.7361	17.519	202.58
Sat.	3.8225	2.5316	1.7361	1.7361	17.121	252.70

### Calculation of time and energy requirements

The time required to form a frozen ground wall was calculated via:

$$t = \frac{R^{2}L + (\frac{a_{r}^{2}-1}{2\ln a_{r}})c_{uf}\nu_{s}}{4k_{f}\nu_{s}} \times \left\{ 2\ln(\frac{R}{r_{0}}) - \left[ \frac{c_{vf}\nu_{s}}{L + (\frac{a_{r}^{2}-1}{2\ln a_{r}})c_{uf}\nu_{s}} \right] \right\}.$$
(8)

The energy required to form a frozen ground wall was calculated via:

$$Q = \pi R^2 \left( L + \left( \frac{a_r^2 - 1}{2 \ln a_r} \right) c_{uf} \nu_s + \frac{c_{vf} \nu_s}{2 \log(\frac{R}{r_0})} \right)$$
 (9)

[Sanger and Sayles, 1979]. The calculated times and energy requirements are presented in Table 3.

#### Original design

The original design had a total of 107.87 m of pipe installed in unsaturated soil. Each meter of pipe would withdraw 202.58 MJ for a total of energy requirement of 4,977.5 kilowatt hours. The actual energy consumption would be higher due to, among

other factors, inefficiencies in the refrigeration and brine-distribution systems and pumps needed to circulate the brine.

#### Revised design

By a similar calculation, the revised design with a 2-m-thick perched aquifer would require 32,501 kilowatt hours of energy. The 4-m-thick and 6-m-thick perched aquifers would require 33,491 and 34,493 kilowatt hours of energy. These are more than six times the energy requirement of the original design.

#### Concluding remarks

The estimated capital and operating costs of the revised design were roughly 6.4 times the original design. This dramatic increase in costs suggested that the expected benefits of the revised plan should be evaluated to determine if they were commensurate.

#### Notation

- $a_r$  distance, relative to R, over which the soil was cooled by the freeze pipe, dimension 1
- $c_{vf}$  volumetric heat capacity of a frozen soil, MJ·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-3</sup>
- $c_{vu}$  volumetric heat capacity of an unfrozen soil, MJ·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-3</sup>
- $c_{vw}$  volumetric heat capacity of liquid water, MJ·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-3</sup>
  - $L f_u \Delta H_{vw}, \, \mathrm{m}^3 \cdot \mathrm{m}^{-3}$
- $f_u$  volumetric fraction of liquid water in the soil,  $m^3 \cdot m^{-3}$
- $f_w$  volumetric fraction of liquid water and ice in the soil,  $m^3 \cdot m^{-3}$
- k thermal conductivity,  $W \cdot {}^{\circ}C^{-1} \cdot m^{-1}$
- $k_{\rm dry}$  thermal conductivity of a dry soil,  $W \cdot {}^{\circ}C^{-1} \cdot m^{-1}$ 
  - $k_f$  thermal conductivity of frozen soil,  $W \cdot {}^{\circ}C^{-1} \cdot m^{-1}$
  - $k_i$  thermal conductivity of ice, W·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-1</sup>
  - $k_s$  thermal conductivity of clay. W·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-1</sup>
- $k_{\rm sat}$  thermal conductivity of a saturated soil,  $W \cdot {}^{\circ}C^{-1} \cdot m^{-1}$
- $k_u$  thermal conductivity of unfrozen soil, W·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-1</sup>
- $k_w$  thermal conductivity of water, W·°C<sup>-1</sup>·m<sup>-1</sup>
- $K_e$  Kersten number, dimension 1
- n porosity,  $m^3 \cdot m^{-3}$
- R one-half the interval between freeze pipes,
- $r_0$  radius of the freeze pipe, m
- n porosity,  $m^3 \cdot m^{-3}$
- Q energy extracted by freeze pipes,  $MJ \cdot m^{-1}$
- $S_r$  degree of saturation, m<sup>3</sup>·m<sup>-3</sup>
- t time required to freeze, s
- $T_{fp}$  freeze pipe temperature, °C
- $T_{\mathrm{mp}}$  melting point temperature, °C
  - $T_s$  soil temperature, °C
- $\Delta H_{vw}$  volumetric enthalpy of fusion for water,  ${
  m MJ\cdot m^{-3}}$ 
  - $\rho_d$  bulk density of the soil, Mg·m<sup>-3</sup>
  - $\rho_w$  density of liquid water, Mg·m<sup>-3</sup>
  - $\nu_0$   $T_s T_{\rm mp}$ , °C
  - $\nu_w \quad T_{\rm mp} T_{fp}, \, {}^{\circ}{\rm C}$

#### References

Alter, A.J., Water supply in cold regions, *Cold Reg. Res. Eng. Lab. Monograph*, III-C5a, 1969.

- Andersland, O.B., and B. Ladanyi, An introduction to frozen ground engineering, New York, Chapman and Hall, 1994.
- Grant, S.A., G.E. Boitnott, A. Tice, Effect of dissolved NaCl on the freezing curves of kaolinite, montmorillonite, and sand pastes, Cold Reg. Res. Eng. Lab. Spec. Rep., 99-2, 1999.
- Sanger, F.J., and F.H. Sayles, Thermally and rheological computations for artificially frozen ground construction, Eng. Geol., 13, 311-337, 1979.

Steven A. Grant, U.S. Army Engineering Research and Development Center, Cold Regions Research & Engineering Laboratory, 72 Lyme Road, Hanover NH 03755. +1-603-646-4446, +1-603-646-4561 fax, steven.a.grant@usace.army.mil

This preprint was prepared with AGU's LATEX macros v4, with the extension package 'AGU<sup>++</sup>' by P. W. Daly, version 1.5g from 1998/09/14.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
data needed, and completing and this burden to Department of Def	d reviewing this collection of in ense, Washington Headquart eat notwithstanding any other	nformation. Send comments regarders Services, Directorate for Info provision of law, no person shall	arding this burden estimate or an rmation Operations and Reports	y other aspect of this co (0704-0188), 1215 Jeffe	ching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the illection of information, including suggestions for reducing erson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. ection of information if it does not display a currently valid	
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-October 2001	YY) 2. REPO	RT TYPE nical Note		3. DAT	FES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE	2000			5a. C0	ONTRACT NUMBER	
Expected Cost Effect of Increasing the Size of a Frozen-Grou Waste Containment Project at Ft. Detrick, Maryland			nd	5b. Gl	b. GRANT NUMBER	
,, <b>u</b> ge <b>c</b> Consuminations		., 1/101/10110		5c. PF	ROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. Pf	ROJECT NUMBER	
Steven A. Grant				5e. TA	ASK NUMBER	
				5f. W0	WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZ	ATION NAME(S) AND A	DDRESS(ES)		8. PEI	RFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT	
U.S. Army Engineer					MBER	
Cold Regions Resear						
72 Lyme Road Hanover, New Hampshire 03755-1290				ERD	OC/CRREL TN-01-1	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SF	PONSOR / MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
					PONSOR / MONITOR'S REPORT UMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAIL	ABILITY STATEMENT					
Approved for public	release; distribution	is unlimited.				
Available from NTIS	s, Springfield, Virgi	nia 22161.				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NO	res					
	k, Maryland. The size				and freezing system for waste isolation as report presents the cost effect of this	
15. SUBJECT TERMS Ft. Detrick Hazardous waste						
Ground freezing						
			17. LIMITATION OF OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)	
U	U	U	U	5		